SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
RICHARD ODEITUS	\$		PENTAGROUP FINANCIAL, LLC		
	•	FENIAGROOF	FINANCIAL, LLC		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ıme, Address, Telephone Number and Email Add	lress)			
Craig Thor Kimmel, E	squire		D CONDEMNATION CASES, US INVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Kimmel & Silverman,					
30 E. Butler Pike		Attorneys (if Known)			
Ambler, PA 19002					
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
		(For Diversity Cases Only)		and One Box for Defendant)	
D 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	☑ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		IF DEF 1 D I incorporated or Pr of Business in Thi		
© 2 U.S. Government	O 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	2 D 2 Incorporated and F	Principal Place () 5 () 5	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In		
		Citizen or Subject of a  Foreign Country	3 CJ 3 Foreign Nation	0606	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT  O 110 Insurance	TORIS	" "	i e	OTHERSTATUTES	
120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR  ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury		☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	O 400 State Reapportionment O 410 Antitrust	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpractic	e 🗇 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking	
150 Recovery of Overpayment			PROPERTY-RIGHTS	450 Commerce 460 Deportation	
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act	Slander © 368 Asbestos Persons © 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	ol G 640 R.R. & Truck  G 650 Airline Regs.	(7) 820 Copyrights (7) 830 Patent	470 Rucketeer Influenced and	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability	☐ 660 Occupational	O 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit	
Student Loans (Exel, Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	TY Safety/Health  G 690 Other		☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV ☐ 810 Selective Service	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 🔘 371 Truth in Lending	LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	S 850 Securities/Commodities/	
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage	710 Fair Labor Standards     Act	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	Exchange  © 875 Customer Challenge	
190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability	: 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410	
☐ 196 Franchise	Injury	730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RS1 (405(g))	890 Other Statutory Actions     891 Agricultural Acts	
REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation	☐ GIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITION ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vacat		FEDERATETAX SUITS  870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	892 Economic Stabilization Act	
220 Foreclosure	O 442 Employment Sentence	791 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	893 Environmental Matters     894 Energy Allocation Act	
230 Rent Lease & Ejectment     240 Torts to Land	Habeas Corpus:     Accommodations     S30 General	Security Act	D 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	895 Freedom of Information     Act	
CJ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty	MMIGRATION	i e	☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination	
[J 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer, w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Oth Employment ☐ 550 Civit Rights	her ☐ 462 Naturalization Application ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus -		Under Equal Access to Justice	
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -    555 Prison Condition Other	Alien Detainee		☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
	440 Other Civil Rights	☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions		State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Appeal to District					
Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from another district 5 Appellate Court Reopened 5 Transferred from another district (specify) 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):  Discreption 1692					
, +, -+, -+ - +,,,,,,	Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices Ac	ct			
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMANDS CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:					
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Ø Yes Ø No					
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER					
Explanation:					
5-27-1 ISI ( m. Thu /)					
DATE OF IT IS I THING INVENTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT					
DATE	/ SIGNATURE OF	FAJITORNEY OF RECORD	-		

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.					
Address of Plaintiff: 234 Roberts Avenue Horsham PA 19044					
Address of Defendant: 5959 Corporate Drive, Ste 1400 Houston, TX 77036					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
(Use Reverse Side For Addi	<u> </u>				
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and a	/				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes No No				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No□				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year p	reviously terminated action in this court?				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit action in this court?					
	Yes No D				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier num	2.00				
terminated action in this court?	Yes No No				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights ca	use filed by the same individual?				
	Yes No Z				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A. Federal Question Cases:  1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:  1. D Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
2. © FELA					
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	2. Airplane Personal Injury				
4. □ Antitrust	3. Assault, Defamation				
5. D Patent	4.  Marine Personal Injury				
	5.  Motor Vehicle Personal Injury				
6. D Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please				
	specify)				
7. Civil Rights	7. D Products Liability				
8. Habeas Corpus	8. © Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases	<ol> <li>□ All other Diversity Cases</li> </ol>				
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. MAIl other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S.C. 1692  (Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION					
I, TUA WY KM MP (Check Appropriate Category)  Louisel of record do hereby certify:					
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of					
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;					
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
DATE: 5-27-11 MILES MER KIMME!	9 1100				
Anomey-at-Law Attorney I.D.#					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court					
except as noted above.					
DATE: 5-27-11 ( NTUR THINK TIMEN)	571 <i>0</i> 7)				
Augmey-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#				

CIV. 609 (6/08)

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

	Richard	Odertu	2-	: :	CIVIL ACTION	
()	Pentagroup	v. Financra	1,2LC	:, : :	NO.	
	plaintiff shall co filing the comple side of this for designation, tha	omplete a Case I aint and serve a c m.) In the ever t defendant shal all other parties	Management To copy on all defe nt that a defend I, with its first s, a Case Mana	rack Designation of the period	luction Plan of this court, couns on Form in all civil cases at the tit 1:03 of the plan set forth on the regree with the plaintiff regarding bmit to the clerk of court and ser Designation Form specifying the	me of verse g said ve on
	SELECT ONE	OF THE FOLI	LOWING CAS	SE MANAGE!	MENT TRACKS:	
	(a) Habeas Corp	pus – Cases bro	ught under 28 1	U.S.C. § 2241 t	hrough § 2255.	( )
	(b) Social Secur and Human	rity – Cases requ Services denyin	iesting review g plaintiff Soc	of a decision of ial Security Ber	f the Secretary of Health nefits.	( )
	(c) Arbitration -	- Cases required	l to be designat	ed for arbitration	on under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	( )
	(d) Asbestos – (exposure to	Cases involving asbestos.	claims for pers	sonal injury or p	property damage from	( )
	commonly re	eferred to as cor See reverse side	nplex and that	need special or	a) through (d) that are intense management by lanation of special	( )
	_	,	ses that do not	fall into any on	e of the other tracks.	X
	5-27-11 Date 215-540-	<u>8888                                 </u>	raig They Attorney-at- 877-788	Krmmel law -2864	Richard Odeite Attorney for Kimmelo creditlan	LS Licon
	Telephone		FAX Numb	er	E-Mail Address	

E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02

# 21.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD M. ODEITUS,	)
Plaintiff	)
v.	) Civil Action No.:
PENTAGROUP FINANCIAL, LLC,	) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
Defendant	) JURY TRIAL )

#### **COMPLAINT**

RICHARD M. ODEITUS ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against PENTAGROUP FINANCIAL, LLC ("Defendant"):

#### INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction over the federal claims contained therein.

- Defendant conducts business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).
  - 5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its principal place of business located at 5959 Corporate Drive, Suite 1400, in Houston, Texas, 77036
- 9. Defendant is a debt collector as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and sought to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and

 misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.

- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24 25 collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. On or about July 20, 2010, Defendant sent correspondence to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment of \$6,373.39 on an alleged debt. See Exhibit A, Defendant's July 20, 2010, letter.
- 18. Defendant's July 20, 2010, letter goes on to state, "If payment is not made in a timely manner, further activity may be instituted." See Exhibit A.
- 19. Defendant's threat that further collection activity may be instituted was done to create a heightened sense of urgency in Plaintiff and to cause Plaintiff to remit payment on the alleged debt. See Exhibit A.
- 20. Defendant's threat that further collection activity may be instituted, overshadows Plaintiff's rights to dispute the alleged debt and/or request verification of the alleged debt. See Exhibit A.
- 21. Additionally, Defendant's notification to Plaintiff of his rights pursuant to §1692g of the FDCPA were misstated, in that Defendant's §1692g notification stated that, "this office will provide you with the name and address of the original credit grantor, if different from the current credit grantor; however, §1692g of the FDCPA requires that the written notice contain

- 22. Defendant's use of the terms "original credit grantor" and "current credit grantor" do not comport with the requirements of the FDCPA and are confusing and misleading to the least sophisticated consumer, like Plaintiff, particularly in light of the fact that Defendant does not refer to any entities in its July 20, 2010, correspondence as "original credit grantor" or "current credit grantor," rather Defendant's letter refers to a "current creditor" and an "original creditor." See Exhibit A.
- 23. Then, on August 27, 2010, Defendant sent Plaintiff a second letter seeking and demanding payment of \$6,373.39 for an alleged consumer debt. See Exhibit B, Defendant's August 27, 2010, letter.
- 24. In its letter, Defendant threatens Plaintiff, "We must assume more firm and direct collection action will be required to collect this past due obligation. You can avoid further collection action by mailing the full balance to our office." See Exhibit B.
- 25. Defendant's threats that further collection activity may be instituted and that more firm and direct collection is required were made to create a heightened sense of urgency in Plaintiff and to scare Plaintiff into making a payment on the alleged debt. See Exhibit B.
- 26. Then, on September 30, 2010, Defendant sent Plaintiff a third collection letter seeking and demanding payment of \$6,373.39 for an alleged consumer debt. See Exhibit C, Defendant's September 30, 2010, letter.
- 27. Defendant's September 30, 2010, letter to Plaintiff is the same letter it sent to him on August 27, 2010. See Exhibits B and C.
  - 28. In its letter, Defendant threatens Plaintiff, "We must assume more firm and direct

 collection action will be required to collect this past due obligation. You can avoid further collection action by mailing the full balance to our office." See Exhibit C.

- 29. Defendant's threats that further collection activity may be instituted and that more firm and direct collection is required were made solely to create a heightened sense of urgency in Plaintiff and to scare Plaintiff into making a payment on the alleged debt. See Exhibit C.
- 30. To date, despite threats to the contrary, Defendant has not filed a lawsuit or taken other legal action against Plaintiff, thereby indicating it did not intend to take the action it threatened in its letters to Plaintiff.
- 31. Defendant's collection letters to Plaintiff were confusing, deceptive, harassing and, misleading.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- 32. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); and Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 33. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u>, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

34. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 35. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Harassing, oppressing or abusing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d.
  - Using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e;

24

25

- d. Threatening to take action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken, in violation of 15 U.S.C § 1692e(5);
- e. Using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt or obtain information concerning Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10);
- f. Using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692f;
- g. Failing to send the consumer written notice containing a statement that, upon the consumer's written request within the thirty-day period, the debt collector will provide the consumer with the name and address of the original creditor, if different from the current creditor, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692g(a);
- h. Overshadowing Plaintiff's right to dispute the debt and/or request the name and address of the original creditor, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692g; and
- i. By acting in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failing to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, RICHARD M. ODEITUS, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and

d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, RICHARD M. ODEITUS, demands a jury trial in this case.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

DATED: 5-27-11

BY: CTK 3654

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID # 57100 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com

## Pentagroup Financial, LLC



5959 Corporate Drive, Suite 1400 Houston, Texas 77036 Toll Free: (800) 997-5339 Houston Local: (832) 615-2281

JULY 2011, 2010

րինիիկաիկակիրութիրարիարինակինակին

S \*\*\*\*\*AUTO\*\*MIXED AADC 350 25327-200/15047041080701947/1480 202 RICHARD M ODEITUS

2

HORSHAM, PA 19044-2445



23124

RE: Current

Current Creditor:

CACH, LLC

Original Creditor:

WAMU/PROVIDIAN BANK

Current Balance Due:

\$6,373.39

Current Account No.:

)1947

Original Account No.:

3642

#### Dear RICHARD M ODBITUS:

Pentagroup Financial, LLC has been hired by the above referenced Current Creditor to contact you regarding the above referenced debt. Please be advised that the Current Creditor listed above has purchased the above referenced debt from the Original Creditor listed above. As of the date of this letter the Current Creditor's records indicate that the Balance Due remains unpaid.

If payment is not made in a timely manner, further collection activity may be instituted. Your prompt attention to this matter will be appreciated.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss your account with one of our courteous and friendly representatives, please call us at the toll flee number listed above.

This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. This is a communication from a debt collector.

Unless you notify this office within 30 days after receiving this notice that you dispute the validity of the debt or any portion thereof, this office will assume this debt is valid. If you notify this office in writing within 30 days from receiving this notice, this office will obtain verification of the debt or obtain a copy of a judgment and mail you a copy of such judgment or verification. If you request this office in writing within 30 days after receiving this notice, this office will provide you with the name and address of the original credit granter, if different from the current credit granter.

indi

PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT

## Pentagroup Financial, LLC

5959 Corporate Drive, Suite 1400 Houston, Texas 77036 Toll Free: (800) 997-5339 Houston Local: (832) 615-2281



AUGUST 27TH, 2010

իդիկմրիինարիանությումի գույլին հանագրարին հ

S \*\*\*\*\* AUTO \*\* MIXED AADC 350 26012-270/15047041080701947/1842 BICHTYDDAY OUBLIANS

HORSHAM, PA 19044-2445



40229

RE:

**Current Creditor:** 

CACH, LLC

Original Creditor:

WAMU/PROVIDIAN BANK \$6,373.39

Current Balance Due: Current Account No.:

11947

3642

Original Account No.:

#### Dear RICHARD M ODEITUS:

We have not received a response to our previous notice requesting full payment of the above referenced account. We must assume more firm and direct collection action will be required to collect this past due obligation. You can avoid further collection action by mailing the full balance to our office.

Please remit the entire balance due to our office.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss your account with one of our representatives please call us at the toll free number listed above.

This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose. This is a communication from a debt collector.

nic2

202,1842



# Case 2:11-cv-03439-TJS Document 1 Filed 05/27/11 Page 15 of 15

5959 Corporate Drive, Suite 1400 Houston, Texas 77036 Toll Free: (800) 997-5339

Houston Local: (832) 615-2281



SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2010

## Ուրդիկյինակոցիչակուրկիկնարկինիկինիցիակա

S \*\*\*\*\*AUTO\*\*MIXED AADC 350 26366-300/15047041080701947/1842 RICHARD M ODEITUS

:02

HORSHAM, PA 19044-2445



40338

RE:

Current Creditor:

Original Creditor:

CACH, LLC WAMU/PROVIDIAN BANK

\$6,373.39

Current Balance Due: Current Account No.:

Original Account No.:

11947 3642

### Dear RICHARD M ODEITUS:

We have not received a response to our previous notice requesting full payment of the above referenced account. We must assume more firm and direct collection action will be required to collect this past due obligation. You can avoid further collection action by mailing the full balance to our office.

Please remit the entire balance due to our office.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss your account with one of our representatives please call us at the toll free number listed above.

This is an attempt to collect a debt and any information obtained will be used for that purpose.

This is a communication from a debt collector.

